

one sentence of your statement in which you referred to the fact that this is the third time in 4 years that an individual labor dispute has required the attention of the Congress. The concern that I have in an emergency situation of this sort is the justification that we have in a single-shot procedure of this sort.

If this legislation is justified now in view of the emergency, to put the leverage on collective bargaining to achieve a result, a settlement, within a reasonable period of time, why aren't we considering general legislation that would apply to such emergency situations? The language of the bill says, "Whereas the Congress finds that an emergency measure is essential to the security and continuity of transportation services by such carriers."

The concern I have is in the danger of this becoming a set pattern of single shooting this problem in terms of legislation dealing with each such emergency. Why shouldn't we be considering general legislation that would meet the emergency situations of this sort when they do arise?

Secretary WIRTZ. If it happens often, I will be here testifying on a different basis. I don't think it should happen often. This is an issue which has a seriously devisive effect on any form in which it is taken up and isn't worth its salt if it happens very often. If it doesn't happen very often, Mr. Jarman, then I will have the feeling that that is a comparatively small price to pay for the avoidance of procedures which they resorted to in the other countries. But it can't happen very often without forcing us to that other point.

I have, in connection with this matter, recently made an inquiry that has to be qualitative about how much the parliaments of other countries are bothered by labor disputes. It is an interesting thing that with the exception of the Scandinavian countries labor problems come to this Congress in individual cases less, if my inquiry is complete enough, than in any other major parliament in the world. But I don't think they ever ought to come up here on an individual case. I think every time they do come up we have taken another step toward the permanent kind of legislation.

A much shorter answer to your question is it becomes a judgment matter. I don't think that the situation which has brought three cases out of 300,000 or 400,000 to this Congress in 4 years is enough to warrant passing legislation which does intrude permanently on the freedom to bargain. I don't know whether five cases would do it or six or whatever it is. It is a very small number.

The country shouldn't be put to this. My short answer—and it should have been shorter—is that I am still hoping very much, and expecting, that it will be possible to keep this number down. I hope it will be the last one. I don't know whether it will be or not.

What I am saying, too, is if it happens very often then you will find me shifting my position.

Mr. JARMAN. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Devine.

Mr. DEVINE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Secretary, would you then look upon this as a temporary solution to a singular problem rather than something that people would use as a pattern in the future?

Secretary WIRTZ. We are talking about the broad problem of labor disputes?